

DECISION DOCUMENT
NATIONWIDE PERMIT 10

This document discusses the factors considered by the Corps of Engineers (Corps) during the issuance process for this Nationwide Permit (NWP). This document contains: (1) the public interest review required by Corps regulations at 33 CFR 320.4(a)(1) and (2); and (2) a discussion of the environmental considerations necessary to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. This evaluation of the NWP includes a discussion of compliance with applicable laws, consideration of public comments, an alternatives analysis, and a general assessment of individual and cumulative impacts, including the general potential effects on each of the public interest factors specified at 33 CFR 320.4(a).

1. MOORING BUOYS. Non-commercial, single-boat, mooring buoys. (Section 10)

General conditions of the NWPs are in the Federal Register notice announcing the reissuance of this NWP. Notification requirements, additional conditions, limitations, and restrictions are in 33 CFR Part 330.

2. STATUTORY AUTHORITY:

Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403)

3. COMPLIANCE WITH RELATED LAWS (33 CFR 320.3):

- (a) General:

NWPs are a type of general permit designed to authorize certain activities that have minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment and generally comply with the related laws cited in 33 CFR 320.3. Activities that result in more than minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually or cumulatively, cannot be authorized by NWPs. Individual review of each activity authorized by an NWP will not normally be performed, except when preconstruction notification to the Corps is required or when an applicant requests verification that an activity complies with an NWP. Potential adverse impacts and compliance with the laws cited in 33 CFR 320.3 are controlled by the terms and conditions of each NWP, regional and case-specific conditions, and the review process that is undertaken prior to the issuance of NWPs.

The evaluation of this NWP, and related documentation, considers compliance with each of the following laws, where applicable: Sections 401, 402, and 404 of the Clean Water Act; Section 307(c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended; Section 302 of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended; the National Environmental

Policy Act of 1969; the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956; the Migratory Marine Game-Fish Act; the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the Federal Power Act of 1920, as amended; the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966; the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; the Endangered Species Act; the Deepwater Port Act of 1974; the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972; Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; the Ocean Thermal Energy Act of 1980; the National Fishing Enhancement Act of 1984; and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation and Management Act. In addition, compliance of the NWP with other Federal requirements, such as Executive Orders and Federal regulations addressing issues such as floodplains, essential fish habitat, and critical resource waters is considered.

(b) Terms and Conditions:

Many NWPs have notification requirements that trigger case-by-case review of certain activities. Two NWP general conditions require case-by-case review of all activities that may adversely affect Federally-listed endangered or threatened species or historic properties (i.e., General Conditions 11 and 12). General Condition 7 restricts the use of NWPs for activities that are located in Federally-designated wild and scenic rivers. None of the NWPs authorize artificial reefs. General Condition 15 prohibits the use of an NWP with other NWPs, except when the acreage loss of waters of the United States does not exceed the highest specified acreage limit of the NWPs used to authorize the single and complete project.

In some cases, activities authorized by an NWP may require other Federal, state, or local authorizations. Examples of such cases include, but are not limited to: activities that are in marine sanctuaries or affect marine sanctuaries or marine mammals; the ownership, construction, location, and operation of ocean thermal conversion facilities or deep water ports beyond the territorial seas; activities that result in discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States and require Section 401 water quality certification; or activities in a state operating under a coastal zone management program approved by the Secretary of Commerce under the Coastal Zone Management Act. In such cases, a provision of the NWPs states that an NWP does not obviate the need to obtain other authorizations required by law. [33 CFR 330.4(b)(2)]

Additional safeguards include provisions that allow the Chief of Engineers, division engineers, and/or district engineers to: assert discretionary authority and require an individual permit for a specific activity; modify NWPs for specific activities by adding special conditions on a case-by-case basis; add conditions on a regional or nationwide basis to certain NWPs; or take action to suspend or revoke an NWP or NWP authorization for activities within a region or state. Regional conditions are imposed to protect important regional concerns and resources. [33 CFR 330.4(e) and 330.5]

(c) Review Process:

The analyses in this document and the coordination that was undertaken prior to the issuance of the NWP fulfill the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and other acts promulgated to protect the quality of the environment.

All NWPs that authorize activities which may result in discharges into waters of the United States require Section 401 water quality certification. NWPs that authorize activities within, or affecting land or water uses within a state that has a Federally-approved coastal zone management program, must also be certified as consistent with the state's program. The procedures to ensure that the NWPs comply with these laws are described in 33 CFR 330.4(c) and (d), respectively.

(d) Public Comment and Response:

For a summary of the public comments received in response to the August 9, 2001, Federal Register notice, refer to the preamble in the Federal Register notice announcing the reissuance of this NWP. The substantive comments received in response to the August 9, 2001, Federal Register notice were used to improve the NWP by changing NWP terms and limits, notification requirements, and/or NWP general conditions, as necessary.

4. INDIVIDUAL AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS:

(a) General Evaluation Criteria:

This document contains a general assessment of the foreseeable effects of the individual activities authorized by this NWP, the anticipated cumulative effects of those activities, and the potential future losses of waters of the United States that are estimated to occur until the expiration date of the NWP. In the assessment of these individual and cumulative effects, the terms and limits of the NWP, notification requirements, and the standard NWP general conditions are considered. The supplementary documentation provided by division engineers will address how regional conditions affect the individual and cumulative effects of the NWP.

The following evaluation comprises the NEPA analysis and the public interest review specified in 33 CFR 320.4(a)(1) and (2).

The issuance of an NWP is based on a general assessment of the effects on public interest and environmental factors that are likely to occur as a result of using this NWP to authorize activities in waters of the United States. As such, this assessment must be speculative or predictive in

general terms. Since NWP's authorize activities across the nation, projects eligible for NWP authorization may be constructed in a wide variety of environmental settings. Therefore, it is difficult to predict all of the indirect impacts that may be associated with each activity authorized by an NWP. For example, the NWP that authorizes 25 cubic yard discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States may be used to fulfill a variety of project purposes. Indication that a factor is not relevant to a particular NWP does not necessarily mean that the NWP would never have an effect on that factor, but that it is a factor not readily identified with the authorized activity. Factors may be relevant, but the adverse effects on the aquatic environment are negligible, such as the impacts of a boat ramp on water level fluctuations or flood hazards. Only the reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect effects are included in the environmental assessment of this NWP. Division and district engineers will impose, as necessary, additional conditions on the NWP authorization or exercise discretionary authority to address locally important factors or to ensure that the authorized activity results in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment. In any case, adverse effects will be controlled by the terms, conditions, and additional provisions of the NWP. For example, Section 7 consultation will be required for activities that may affect endangered species.

(b) NEPA Alternatives:

This evaluation includes an analysis of alternatives based on the requirements of NEPA, which requires a more expansive review than the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. The alternatives discussed below are based on an analysis of the potential environmental impacts and impacts to the Corps, Federal and state resource agencies, general public, and prospective permittees.

(i) No Action Alternative (no Nationwide Permit):

The no action alternative would not achieve one of the goals of the Corps Nationwide Permit program, which is to reduce the regulatory burden on applicants for activities that result in minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually or cumulatively. The no action alternative would also reduce the Corps ability to pursue the current level of review for other activities that have greater adverse effects on the aquatic environment, including activities that require individual permits as a result of the Corps exercising its discretionary authority under the NWP program. The no action alternative would also reduce the Corps ability to conduct compliance actions.

If this NWP is not available, substantial additional resources would be required for the Corps to evaluate these minor activities through the individual permit process, and for the public and Federal and state resource agencies to review and comment on the large number of public notices for these activities. In a considerable majority of cases, when the Corps publishes

public notices for proposed activities that result in minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, the Corps typically does not receive responses to these public notices from either the public or Federal and state resource agencies. Another important benefit of the NWP program that would not be achieved through the no action alternative is the incentive for project proponents to design their projects so that those activities meet the terms and conditions of an NWP. The Corps believes the NWPs have significantly reduced adverse effects to the aquatic environment because most applicants modify their projects to comply with the NWPs and avoid the delays and costs typically associated with the individual permit process.

In the absence of this NWP, Department of the Army (DA) authorization in the form of another general permit (i.e., regional or programmatic general permits, where available) or individual permits would be required. Corps district offices may develop regional general permits if an NWP is not available, but this is an impractical and inefficient method for activities with minimal individual or cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment that are conducted across the Nation. Not all districts would develop these regional general permits for a variety of reasons. The regulated public, especially those companies that conduct work in more than one Corps district, would be adversely affected by the widespread use of regional general permits because of the greater potential for lack of consistency and predictability in the authorization of similar activities with minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment. These companies would incur greater costs in their efforts to comply with different regional general permit requirements between Corps districts. Nevertheless, in some states Corps districts have issued programmatic general permits to take the place of this and other NWPs. However, this approach only works in states with regulatory programs comparable to the Corps Regulatory Program.

(ii) National Modification Alternatives:

Since the Corps Nationwide Permit program began in 1977, the Corps has continuously strived to develop NWPs that authorize activities that result only in minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually or cumulatively. Every five years the Corps reevaluates the NWPs during the reissuance process, and may modify an NWP to address concerns for the aquatic environment. Utilizing collected data and institutional knowledge concerning activities authorized by the Corps regulatory program, the Corps constantly reevaluates the potential impacts of activities authorized by NWPs. The Corps also uses substantive public comments on proposed NWPs to assess the expected impacts. This NWP was developed to authorize non-commercial, single-boat, mooring buoys in navigable waters of the United States. The Corps has considered modifying or adding NWP general conditions, as discussed in the preamble of the Federal Register notice announcing the reissuance of this NWP.

(iii) Regional Modification Alternatives:

An important aspect for the NWP is the increased emphasis on regional conditions to address differences in aquatic resource functions and values across the nation. Division engineers can add regional conditions to the NWP to enhance protection of the aquatic environment and address local concerns. Division engineers can also revoke an NWP if the use of that NWP results in more than minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, especially in high value or unique wetlands and other waters.

Corps divisions and districts also monitor and analyze the cumulative adverse effects of the NWP on a watershed basis, and if warranted, further restrict or prohibit the use of the NWP to ensure that the NWP do not authorize activities that result in more than minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment. To the maximum extent practicable, division and district engineers will use regulatory databases and institutional knowledge about the typical adverse effects of activities authorized by NWP, as well as substantive public comments, to assess the individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment resulting from regulated activities. When conducting this assessment, division and district engineers can only consider those activities regulated by the Corps under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972. Adverse impacts resulting from activities outside of the Corps scope of analysis, such as the construction or expansion of upland developments, cannot be considered in the Corps analysis of cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment.

(iv) Case-specific On-site Alternatives:

Although the terms and conditions for this NWP have been established at the national level to authorize most activities that have minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, division and district engineers have the authority to impose case-specific special conditions on an NWP authorization to ensure that the authorized work will result in minimal adverse effects.

General Condition 19 requires the permittee to minimize and avoid impacts to waters of the United States on-site to the maximum extent practicable. Off-site alternatives cannot be considered for activities authorized by NWP. During the evaluation of a preconstruction notification, the District Engineer may determine that additional avoidance and minimization is practicable. The District Engineer may also condition the NWP authorization to require compensatory mitigation to offset losses of waters of the United States and ensure that the net adverse effects on the aquatic environment are minimal. As another example, the NWP authorization can be conditioned to prohibit the permittee from conducting the work during specific times of the year to protect spawning fish and shellfish. If the proposed work will result in more than minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, then the District Engineer will exercise discretionary authority and require an individual permit. Discretionary authority can be asserted where there are concerns for the aquatic environment, including high value aquatic

habitats. The individual permit review process requires a project-specific alternatives analysis, including the consideration of off-site alternatives, and a public interest review.

(c) Impact Analysis

(i) General:

This NWP authorizes the installation of non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys in navigable waters of the United States. This NWP does not authorize discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. There is no acreage limit for this NWP.

This NWP does not require notification to the District Engineer. However, division engineers can regionally condition this NWP to allow case-by-case review of certain activities authorized by this NWP, to ensure that those activities result in minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment. If the District Engineer determines that the adverse effects of a particular project are more than minimal after considering mitigation, then discretionary authority will be asserted and the applicant will be notified that another form of DA authorization, such as a regional general permit or individual permit, is required (see 33 CFR 330.4(e) and 330.5).

Additional conditions can be placed on proposed activities on a regional or case-by-case basis to ensure that the work has minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment. Regional conditioning of this NWP will be used to account for differences in aquatic resource functions and values across the country, ensure that the NWP authorizes only those activities with minimal individual or cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment, and allow each Corps district to prioritize its workload based on where its efforts will best serve to protect the aquatic environment. Regional conditions can prohibit the use of an NWP in certain waters (e.g., high value waters or specific types of wetlands or waters) or require notification for all work in certain watersheds or types of waters. Specific NWPs can also be revoked on a geographic or watershed basis where the adverse effects resulting from the use of those NWPs are more than minimal.

In high value waters, division and district engineers can: 1) prohibit the use of the NWP in those waters and require an individual permit or regional general permit; 2) require notification for all activities in those waters; 3) add regional conditions to the NWP to ensure that the adverse environmental effects are minimal; or 4) for those activities that require notification, add special conditions to NWP authorizations, such as compensatory mitigation requirements, to ensure that the adverse effects on the aquatic environment are minimal. NWPs can authorize activities in high value waters as long as the individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment are minimal.

The construction and use of fills for temporary access for construction may be authorized by

NWP 33 or regional general permits issued by division or district engineers. The related work must meet the terms and conditions of the specified permit(s). If the activity is dependent on portions of a larger project that require an individual permit, this NWP will not apply. [See 33 CFR 330.6(c) and (d)]

(ii) Public interest review factors (33 CFR 320.4(a)(1)):

For each of the 20 public interest review factors, the extent of the Corps consideration of expected impacts resulting from the use of this NWP is discussed, as well as the reasonably foreseeable cumulative adverse effects that are expected to occur. The Corps decision process involves consideration of the benefits and detriments that may result from the activities authorized by this NWP.

(a) Conservation: The activities authorized by this NWP may modify the natural resource characteristics of the project area. Compensatory mitigation, if required for activities authorized by this NWP, will result in the restoration, enhancement, creation, or preservation of aquatic habitats that will offset losses of conservation values. The adverse effects of activities authorized by this NWP on conservation will be minor, since the NWP authorizes only those activities with minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment and the Corps scope of analysis is usually limited to impacts to aquatic resources.

(b) Economics: The installation of mooring buoys will have positive impacts on the local economy. These activities will generate jobs and revenue for local contractors as well as revenue to marine supply companies that sell mooring buoys and associated materials, such as rope, chains, and anchors.

(c) Aesthetics: Mooring buoys may alter the visual character of some waters of the United States. The extent and perception of these changes will vary, depending on the size and configuration of the mooring buoy, the nature of the surrounding area, and the public uses of the area. The increased human use of the project area and surrounding land will also alter local aesthetic values.

(d) General environmental concerns: Activities authorized by this NWP have negligible adverse effects on general environmental concerns, such as water, air, noise, and land pollution. The adverse effects of the activities authorized by this NWP on general environmental concerns will be minor, since the NWP authorizes only those activities with minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment. Compensatory mitigation may be required by district engineers to ensure that the net adverse effects on the aquatic environment are minimal. It is important to note that the Corps scope of analysis is usually limited to impacts to aquatic resources. Specific environmental concerns are addressed in other sections of this document.

(e) Wetlands: The installation of non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys will have little or no adverse effects on wetlands, since these structures are located in open waters. This NWP does not authorize discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands. Some wetlands may be temporarily impacted by the work through the use of temporary staging areas and access roads. These wetlands will be restored, unless the District Engineer authorizes another use for the area, but the plant community may be different. For most activities requiring notification, compensatory mitigation will be required to offset the loss of wetlands and ensure that the adverse effects to the aquatic environment are minimal.

Wetlands provide habitat, including foraging, nesting, spawning, rearing, and resting sites for aquatic and terrestrial species. The destruction of wetlands may alter natural drainage patterns. Wetlands reduce erosion by stabilizing the substrate. Wetlands also act as storage areas for stormwater and flood waters. Wetlands may act as groundwater discharge or recharge areas. The loss of wetland vegetation will adversely affect water quality because these plants trap sediments, pollutants, and nutrients and transform chemical compounds. Wetland vegetation also provides habitat for microorganisms that remove nutrients and pollutants from water. Wetlands, through the accumulation of organic matter, act as sinks for some nutrients and other chemical compounds, reducing the amounts of these substances in the water.

General Condition 19 requires on-site avoidance and minimization of impacts to waters of the United States, including wetlands. Compensatory mitigation may be required by district engineers to ensure that the net adverse effects on the aquatic environment are minimal. General Condition 25 requires notification to the District Engineer, to ensure that the activities authorized by this NWP will not result in more than minimal adverse effects to critical resource waters and adjacent wetlands, which may include high value wetlands. District engineers can also add case-specific special conditions to the NWP authorization to provide protection to wetlands.

(f) Historic properties: General Condition 12 states that the NWPs cannot authorize activities that affect historic properties listed, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places, until the District Engineer has complied with 33 CFR Part 325, Appendix C. The provisions of Appendix C ensure that activities authorized by NWPs comply with the National Historic Preservation Act.

(g) Fish and wildlife values: This NWP authorizes activities in navigable waters of the United States, including rivers, estuaries, oceans, and lakes, which provide habitat to many species of fish and wildlife. Activities authorized by this NWP will cause negligible changes to the habitat values of these waters. Open waters, including vegetated shallows, provide foraging areas, resting areas, and nesting and breeding grounds. Compensatory mitigation may be required by district engineers to restore, enhance, create, and/or preserve wetlands and other aquatic habitats to offset losses of waters of the United States. These methods of compensatory mitigation will provide fish and wildlife habitat values.

General Condition 4 will reduce the adverse effects to fish and other aquatic species by prohibiting activities that substantially disrupt the necessary life cycle movements of indigenous aquatic species, unless the primary purpose of the activity is to impound water. Compliance with General Conditions 17 and 20 will ensure that the authorized work has minimal adverse effects on shellfish beds and spawning areas, respectively. The authorized work cannot have more than minimal adverse effects on breeding areas for migratory waterfowl, due to the requirements of General Condition 23.

Pursuant to Section 305(b)(2) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation Management Act, the Corps entered into programmatic Essential Fish Habitat consultation with the NMFS. As discussed elsewhere in this document (i.e., Section 4(c)(ii)(g), Section 4(c)(iii)(h), and Section 4(c)(iii)(l)), the NWP contains provisions that will ensure that impacts to Essential Fish Habitat are minimal, individually or cumulatively. Division and district engineers can impose regional and special conditions to ensure that activities authorized by this NWP will result in minimal adverse effects on Essential Fish Habitat.

(h) Flood hazards: The activities authorized by this NWP will not affect the flood-holding capacity of 100-year floodplains, including surface water flow velocities, because the activities authorized by this NWP occur in open, navigable waters.

(i) Floodplain values: Activities authorized by this NWP will have no adverse effects on the flood-holding capacity of floodplains, or other floodplain values. The fish and wildlife habitat values of floodplains will not be adversely affected by activities authorized by this NWP, since the NWP authorizes activities in open, navigable waters.

(j) Land use: Activities authorized by this NWP will not result in changes in land use, since it authorizes the installation of non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys in navigable waters of the United States. Since the primary responsibility for land use decisions is held by state, local, and Tribal governments, the Corps scope of analysis is limited to significant issues of overriding national importance, such as navigation and water quality (see 33 CFR 320.4(j)(2)).

(k) Navigation: Activities authorized by this NWP must comply with General Condition 1, which states that no activity may cause more than minimal adverse effects on navigation.

(l) Shore erosion and accretion: The activities authorized by this NWP will have no adverse effects on shore erosion and accretion processes, since the NWP authorizes only non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys in navigable waters of the United States. This NWP does not authorize discharges of dredged or fill material that could affect shore erosion and accretion processes.

(m) Recreation: Activities authorized by this NWP may change the recreational uses of the area. The installation of non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys may increase the use of particular waterways by recreational boaters. Certain recreational activities, such as bird watching, hunting, and fishing may be affected by the installation of mooring buoys and their use, but such effects are likely to be negligible.

(n) Water supply and conservation: Activities authorized by this NWP will have no adverse effects on surface water and groundwater supplies. This NWP authorizes the installation of non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys in navigable waters of the United States. Activities authorized by this NWP will not change demands for potable water in the region. Activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to affect the quality of water supplies by adding pollutants and toxic chemicals to surface waters and groundwater. Many causes of water pollution, such as discharges regulated under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, are outside the Corps scope of analysis.

(o) Water quality: The activities authorized by this NWP will have negligible adverse effects on water quality. This NWP does not authorize discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands. During the installation of mooring buoys authorized by this NWP, small amounts of oil and grease from construction equipment may be discharged into the waterway. Because most of the construction will occur during a relatively short period of time, the frequency and concentration of these discharges are not expected to have more than minimal adverse effects on overall water quality.

(p) Energy needs: The activities authorized by this NWP will have negligible adverse effects on energy consumption in the area.

(q) Safety: The activities authorized by this NWP will be subject to Federal, state, and local safety laws and regulations. Therefore, this NWP will not adversely affect the safety of the project area.

(r) Food and fiber production: Activities authorized by this NWP will have no adverse effects on food and fiber production, since it authorizes only non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys in navigable waters of the United States.

(s) Mineral needs: Activities authorized by this NWP are unlikely to increase demand for aggregates and stone, although some project proponents may use aggregates and stone to construct anchors for mooring buoys. Activities authorized by this NWP may increase the demand for cables and chains made from metals, which are made from mineral ores.

(t) Considerations of property ownership: The NWP complies with 33 CFR 320.4(g), which states that an inherent aspect of property ownership is a right to reasonable private use. The

NWP provides expedited DA authorization for the installation of non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys in navigable waters of the United States. The installation of mooring buoys may improve navigable access for certain landowners.

- (iii) Threatened and endangered species: The Corps believes that the procedures currently in place result in proper coordination under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and ensure that activities authorized by this NWP will not jeopardize the continued existence or any listed threatened and endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. The Corps also believes that current local procedures in Corps districts are effective in ensuring compliance with ESA.

Each activity authorized by an NWP is subject to General Condition 11, which states that “no activity is authorized under any NWP which is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species or a species proposed for such designation, as identified under the Federal Endangered Species Act, or which is likely to modify the critical habitat of such species.” In addition, General Condition 11 explicitly states that the NWP does not authorize the taking of threatened or endangered species, which will ensure that permittees do not mistake the NWP authorization as a Federal authorization to take threatened or endangered species. General Condition 11 also requires the applicant to notify the District Engineer if there are endangered or threatened species in the vicinity of the project.

Under the current Corps regulations (33 CFR 325.2(b)(5)), the District Engineer must review all permit applications for potential impacts on threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. For the NWP program, this review occurs when the District Engineer evaluates the preconstruction notification or request for verification. Based on the evaluation of all available information, the District Engineer will initiate consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), as appropriate, if he or she determines that the regulated activity may affect any threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Consultation may occur during the NWP authorization process or the district engineer may exercise discretionary authority to require an individual permit for the proposed activity and initiate consultation through the individual permit process. If ESA consultation is conducted during the NWP authorization process without the District Engineer exercising discretionary authority, then the applicant will be notified that he or she cannot proceed with the proposed activity until ESA consultation is complete. If the District Engineer determines that the activity will have no effect on any threatened and endangered species or critical habitat, then the District Engineer will notify the applicant that he or she may proceed under the NWP authorization.

Corps districts have, in most cases, established informal or formal procedures with local offices of the FWS and NMFS, through which the agencies share information regarding threatened and endangered species and their critical habitat. This information helps district engineers determine if a proposed activity will affect endangered species or their critical habitat and, if necessary,

initiate consultation. Corps districts may utilize maps or databases that identify locations of populations of threatened and endangered species and their critical habitat. Regional conditions are added to NWP, where necessary, to require notification for activities that occur in known locations of threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. For activities that require agency coordination during the notification process, the FWS and NMFS will review the proposed work for potential impacts to threatened and endangered species and their critical habitat. Any information provided by local maps and databases and any comments received during the notification process will be used by the district engineer to make a “may affect” or “not likely to adversely affect” decision.

Based on the safeguards discussed above, especially General Condition 11, the Corps has determined that the activities authorized by this NWP will not jeopardize the continued existence of any listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. Although the Corps continues to believe that these procedures ensure compliance with ESA, the Corps has taken some steps to provide further assurance. Corps district offices have met with local representatives of the FWS and NMFS to establish or modify existing procedures, where necessary, to ensure that the Corps has the latest information regarding the existence and location of any threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat. Corps districts can also establish, through local procedures or other means, additional safeguards that ensure compliance with ESA. Through formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, or through other coordination with the FWS and/or the NMFS, as appropriate, the Corps will establish procedures to ensure that the NWP will not jeopardize any threatened and endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. Such procedures will be included as regional conditions to the NWPs or as special conditions of an NWP authorization, if necessary.

(iv) Cumulative Impacts:

The cumulative impacts of an NWP generally do not depend on the number of times the permit is used on a national basis but on the number of times the NWP and other DA permits are used within a specific geographic area, particularly a watershed. In a specific watershed, division or district engineers may determine that the cumulative adverse effects of activities authorized by NWPs are more than minimal. Division and district engineers will monitor and review geographic areas that may be subject to more than minimal cumulative adverse effects. Division and district engineers have the authority to require individual permits where the cumulative adverse effects are more than minimal, or add conditions to the NWP either on a case-by-case or regional basis to ensure that the cumulative adverse effects are minimal. When division or district engineers determine that a geographic area is subject to more than minimal cumulative adverse effects due to the use of the NWPs, they will use the revocation and modification procedure at 33 CFR 330.5. In reaching the final decision, they will compile information on the cumulative adverse effects and supplement this document.

Based on reported use of this NWP in calendar year 2000 and an estimate of the number of mooring buoys installed in navigable waters of the United States each year, the Corps estimates that this NWP will be used approximately 2,500 times per year, with approximately zero acres of wetland impacts. The Corps estimates that approximately zero acres of compensatory mitigation will be required to offset these impacts. The demand for these types of activities could increase or decrease over the five-year duration of this NWP. Using the current trend, approximately 12,500 NWP 10 activities could be authorized over a five year period until this NWP expires, resulting in the loss of approximately zero acres of wetlands. Approximately zero acres of compensatory mitigation would be required to offset those losses of waters of the United States. The Corps expects that the convenience and time savings associated with the use of this NWP will encourage applicants to design their projects within the scope of the NWP rather than request individual permits for projects which could result in greater adverse impacts to the aquatic environment.

(d) Additional Public Interest Review Factors (33 CFR 320.4(a)(2)):

(i) Relative extent of the public and private need for the proposed structure or work:

This NWP authorizes the installation of non-commercial, single-boat mooring buoys in navigable waters of the United States, that have minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment, individually and cumulatively. These activities satisfy public and private needs such as mooring facilities for recreational vessels. The need for this NWP is based upon the large number of these activities that occur annually with minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment.

(ii) Where there are unresolved conflicts as to resource use, the practicability of using reasonable alternative locations and methods to accomplish the objective of the proposed structure or work:

Most situations in which there are unresolved conflicts concerning resource use arise when environmentally sensitive areas are involved (e.g., special aquatic sites, including wetlands) or where there are competing uses of a resource. The nature and scope of the activity, when planned and constructed in accordance with the terms and conditions of this NWP, reduce the likelihood of such conflict. In the event that there is a conflict, the NWP contains provisions that are capable of resolving the matter (see Sections 1 and 3 of this document).

General Condition 19 requires permittees to avoid and minimize impacts to waters of the United States to the maximum extent practicable on the project site. Consideration of off-site alternative locations is not required for activities that are authorized by general permits. General permits authorize activities that have minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment and overall public interest. District engineers will exercise discretionary

authority and require an individual permit if the proposed work will result in more than minimal adverse environmental effects on the project site. The consideration of off-site alternatives can be required during the individual permit process.

- (iii) The extent and permanence of the beneficial and/or detrimental effects which the proposed structure or work is likely to have on the public and private uses to which the area is suited:

The nature and scope of the work authorized by the NWP will most likely restrict the extent of the beneficial and detrimental effects to the area immediately surrounding the mooring buoy. Activities authorized by this NWP will have minimal adverse effects on the aquatic environment.

A provision of the NWPs requires that the activity, including all attendant features, both temporary and permanent, is part of a single and complete project.

As previously stated, the terms, conditions, and provisions of the NWP were developed to ensure that individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects are minimal. Specifically, NWPs do not obviate the need for the permittee to obtain other Federal, state, or local authorizations required by law. The NWPs do not grant any property rights or exclusive privileges (see 33 CFR 330.4(b) for further information). Additional conditions, limitations, restrictions, and provisions for discretionary authority, as well as the ability to add activity-specific or regional conditions to this NWP, will provide further safeguards to the aquatic environment and the overall public interest. There are also provisions to allow suspension, modification, or revocation of the NWP. Refer to Sections 1 and 3 of this document for further information and procedures.

5. Final Determinations:

(a) Finding of No Significant Impact:

Based on the information in this document, the Corps has determined that the issuance of this NWP will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

(b) Public Interest Determination:

In accordance with the requirements of 33 CFR 320.4, the Corps has determined, based on the information in this document, that the issuance of this NWP is not contrary to the public interest.

(c) Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act General Conformity Rule Review:

This NWP has been analyzed for conformity applicability pursuant to regulations implementing Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act. It has been determined that the activities authorized by

this permit will not exceed de minimis levels of direct emissions of a criteria pollutant or its precursors and are exempted by 40 CFR 93.153. Any later indirect emissions are generally not within the Corps continuing program responsibility and generally cannot be practicably controlled by the Corps. For these reasons, a conformity determination is not required for this NWP.

- (d) Public Hearing: A public hearing was held on September 26, 2001, in Washington, D.C. to solicit comments on the proposed issuance of this NWP.

FOR THE COMMANDER

Date: 04 JAN 2002

/s/

ROBERT H. GRIFFIN
Brigadier General, U.S. Army
Director of Civil Works